

"LET THEM THINK!"—VON BERNSTORFF.

New York Tribune.

First to Last—The Truth—News—Editorials—Advertisements.

MONDAY, MAY 10, 1915.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation, 410 N. York St., New York, N. Y. Entered as second-class matter, May 10, 1879, under act of October 3, 1917, authorized for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in act of October 3, 1917, authorized for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in act of October 3, 1917, authorized for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in act of October 3, 1917.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: By Mail, Postpaid, outside of New York City: One year, \$10.00; Six months, \$6.00; Three months, \$3.50. In Advance. Single Copies, 10 Cents. Delivery by carrier, outside of New York City, 15 Cents per copy. New York City, by carrier, 10 Cents per copy. Outside of New York City, by mail, 15 Cents per copy. Foreign, by mail, 25 Cents per copy. Canada, by mail, 15 Cents per copy. Mexico, by mail, 15 Cents per copy. Central America, by mail, 15 Cents per copy. Caribbean Islands, by mail, 15 Cents per copy. South America, by mail, 15 Cents per copy. Europe, by mail, 25 Cents per copy. Africa, by mail, 25 Cents per copy. Asia, by mail, 25 Cents per copy. Australia, by mail, 25 Cents per copy. New Zealand, by mail, 25 Cents per copy. South Africa, by mail, 25 Cents per copy. India, by mail, 25 Cents per copy. China, by mail, 25 Cents per copy. Japan, by mail, 25 Cents per copy. Philippines, by mail, 25 Cents per copy. Hawaii, by mail, 25 Cents per copy. Alaska, by mail, 25 Cents per copy. Canada, by mail, 15 Cents per copy. Mexico, by mail, 15 Cents per copy. Central America, by mail, 15 Cents per copy. Caribbean Islands, by mail, 15 Cents per copy. South America, by mail, 15 Cents per copy. Europe, by mail, 25 Cents per copy. Africa, by mail, 25 Cents per copy. Asia, by mail, 25 Cents per copy. Australia, by mail, 25 Cents per copy. New Zealand, by mail, 25 Cents per copy. South Africa, by mail, 25 Cents per copy. India, by mail, 25 Cents per copy. China, by mail, 25 Cents per copy. Japan, by mail, 25 Cents per copy. Philippines, by mail, 25 Cents per copy. Hawaii, by mail, 25 Cents per copy. Alaska, by mail, 25 Cents per copy.

FOREIGN RATES: By Mail, Postpaid, outside of New York City: One year, \$10.00; Six months, \$6.00; Three months, \$3.50. In Advance. Single Copies, 10 Cents. Delivery by carrier, outside of New York City, 15 Cents per copy. New York City, by carrier, 10 Cents per copy. Outside of New York City, by mail, 15 Cents per copy. Foreign, by mail, 25 Cents per copy. Canada, by mail, 15 Cents per copy. Mexico, by mail, 15 Cents per copy. Central America, by mail, 15 Cents per copy. Caribbean Islands, by mail, 15 Cents per copy. South America, by mail, 15 Cents per copy. Europe, by mail, 25 Cents per copy. Africa, by mail, 25 Cents per copy. Asia, by mail, 25 Cents per copy. Australia, by mail, 25 Cents per copy. New Zealand, by mail, 25 Cents per copy. South Africa, by mail, 25 Cents per copy. India, by mail, 25 Cents per copy. China, by mail, 25 Cents per copy. Japan, by mail, 25 Cents per copy. Philippines, by mail, 25 Cents per copy. Hawaii, by mail, 25 Cents per copy. Alaska, by mail, 25 Cents per copy.

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second-Class Matter, May 10, 1879, under act of October 3, 1917, authorized for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in act of October 3, 1917, authorized for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in act of October 3, 1917, authorized for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in act of October 3, 1917.

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for if dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape, no quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

"A Magnificent Spectacle."

It is reasonable that we should rejoice in the brave show our battleships make in the North River. It is very proper that our acting Mayor should welcome the fleet as "one of the most magnificent spectacles ever seen in our waters," for so it is. If a spectacle were the only thing required there would indeed be small cause for dissatisfaction or misgivings. But there is something more than this in the minds of thoughtful men to-day, something that Admiral Fletcher glanced at in his brief but significant acknowledgment of the city's greetings. "I accept these," he said, "as an appreciation of the interest that the people are taking in the American navy and of their realization that the defence of our country lies first upon the water rather than upon the land. I think," he added gravely, "the people of this country are beginning to realize that situation."

For confidence in the quality of the personnel there is reason enough, but the maxim that it is the human element that wins battles is subject to human limitations, and it is obvious that a fleet undermanned and in many respects so poorly equipped as ours cannot be turned into an efficient fighting force overnight. "We look like an efficient fleet as we lie here in this river," said one of the naval officers on Saturday; "we look pretty fine, but I don't think we would stand up two hours in contest against a modern European fleet. . . . Does anybody in possession of all his senses believe for one minute that we are ready for a war?" It is not as if this were the singular opinion of a notorious grumbler; among the many whose views were quoted in The Tribune yesterday we look in vain for one inclined in any way to make light of our manifest unpreparedness.

A few years ago our fleet was the second of the world, in some respects twice as strong as Germany's; to-day we see it deficient in divers respects, wanting in officers and men, wanting in vessels of several classes, wanting in many things essential to the making of such a navy as this country needs. It may appear churlish to insist on these deficiencies at this moment, yet to do so is only to echo the sentiments openly expressed by the men of the fleet. They know its shortcomings best of all men, and all men know that it is not they who are responsible for them.

Unbiased Views on Strong Drink.

Moderate drinkers (if the teetotalers will allow that such a class exists) find it difficult to accommodate their vision to the modern idea of alcohol as a poison so frightfully destructive that even the most cautious consumer of light wines or small beer is to all intents and purposes a suicide, nor, in contemplating the manifest evil of intemperance, can they readily accept the fashionable estimate of its enormity in comparison with all other evils. The drinking nations have somehow survived, a circumstance which would be wellnigh incredible if all the hard things that have lately been said about alcohol were true, and in the light of common experience it is possible to look forward without much apprehension to a more or less alcoholic future.

That is the view of the ordinary drinker, but it is not the view of the reformer. Colonel Maus, of the army medical corps, has again been proclaiming his opinion on the matter, and, as one of the most valiant and persevering foes of alcohol, his opinion is of singular interest. To his mind "alcohol and military service are utterly at variance," and his great hope to-day is that the present war may result in the rout of strong drink. "Even if the war in Europe costs ten billion dollars," he says, "if it destroys five million human lives and devastates the fairest countries of the world, it will be a small price to pay compared with the value of total abstinence among those nations for succeeding generations." And he is satisfied that this must be the event of the great struggle, inasmuch as it is "not only a war of men against men but a war against the greatest evil the world has ever known."

It must be a little discouraging to Colonel Maus to learn that none of the chiefs of the European armies are of his opinion on the incompatibility of alcohol and military service. Rum seems to be served pretty regularly to the French and British troops; beer, brandy, arrack or rum to the Germans, and wine, with an occasional dose of spirits, to the Austrians. Nor have the efforts of abstainers at home modified the doses at all—even the British, in spite of the violent agitation, continue to get their two and a half ounces whenever the medical officers think they need it.

Colonel Maus thinks "any man has as much right to take a hypodermic injection of morphia or cocaine as a drink of whiskey," and he hopes by the time the war is over a majority will share his opinion. Unfortunately there are still a great

many so-called moderate drinkers in the world, and the moderate drinkers are apt to think that such reformers as Colonel Maus have an exaggerated conception of the evil they are fighting. But then there is the other view, the view expressed by Colonel Maus's illustrious colleague and co-reformer, Sir Victor Horsley, who will not allow that any drinker can be moderate, and has lately declared his belief that absence of exaggeration "is the most attractive feature of teetotalism," that "there is no exaggeration possible in total abstinence," but that controversy on the subject is difficult, for the plain and obvious reason that "such human defects as exaggeration and bias are the early and common consequence of taking drugs such as alcohol."

Husbands and Housewifery.

Mrs. Thetta Quay Franks, who has found that the ancient profession of housewifery has suffered a grievous decline, would have her sisters turn over a new leaf and give the American husband a square deal. And since she has presented so vividly and appealingly the case of the abused, if undeserving, American husband, it seems only fair and chivalrous that the side of the American housewife be heard.

Arnold Bennett, among other foreign observers, has epitomized the latter's complaint in his picture of the utter absorption of the American business or professional man in his business or profession, an absorption that excludes the details of homekeeping from his consciousness. His wife, in saving his money, in tempting his appetite, is put in the position of one playing to an audience that is dozing or reading. She finds the role eminently discouraging.

The time to berate her for turning his digestive apparatus and his household budget over to the tender care of servants, therefore, will come when the American husband begins to show his appreciation of a square deal. And then the scolding may become superfluous, since with the more temperamental sex appreciation alone often accomplishes wonders.

Sentiment and Foresight.

In the horror and dismay excited by the sinking of the Lusitania it must not be forgotten that there never was any good ground for the hope that the Germans would spare passenger vessels upon humane considerations. Seeing that some months before the blockade was declared the Admiral Ganteaume, with two thousand non-combatants on board, was ruthlessly torpedoed without the slightest warning, it was hardly to be expected that after the formal proclamation of the imperial government scruples of conscience would be allowed to interfere with the work of the submarine commanders.

If there was actually but little apprehension among the Lusitania's passengers, their equanimity may be attributed in part to the belief that for prudential reasons care would be taken to avoid the murder of neutrals, but in the main it was probably due to the comparative failure of the blockade. More than a million troops have been conveyed to various places in British ships in the last eight months, some hundreds of thousands have crossed the English Channel since the war began, yet in all that time not a single transport has been sunk. As it has been known for a long time that German submarines had succeeded in evading the British minefields and were at large in the Channel, so it was certain that if it had been possible they would have attacked the many troopships constantly crossing between England and France; their failure to do any damage in this way was so reassuring that the danger to fast liners came to be regarded as too remote for serious consideration. And there is still good reason to regard such danger as remote.

Of late, indeed, many naval men in England were beginning to speculate anew on the purpose of the blockade, beginning to wonder whether it had really been undertaken as an end in itself or devised as a sort of feint to cover some other and more ambitious enterprise. Thus it was suggested quite recently by an acute student of naval strategy that just as the seemingly futile bombardment of Scarborough was probably but part of a more important project that proved abortive in the event, so it might well be that the pretended blockade was in reality only a preparatory move in a concerted submarine attack on the British fleet.

The instant effect of the recent disaster on the stock exchanges shows that it is unnecessary to invent such hypotheses to account for the German policy. Their aim is to terrify, and that this would be their aim was long ago foreseen by Admiral Sir Percy Scott. By an extraordinary stroke of fortune they have at last succeeded in catching a great liner, and at the same time shown that those who argued against the likelihood of such an attempt on merely moral grounds did not understand German intentions as clearly as Sir Percy Scott. Lord Sydenham had argued that, setting aside all considerations of humanity, "this relapse into savagery would not serve the purpose of the navy which so far degraded itself." Sir Percy Scott brushed such reasoning aside as academic, and to support his apprehensions produced the following passage from a letter written by "a foreign naval officer," presumably a German:

"If we went to war with an insular country depending for its food supplies from overseas it would be our business to stop that supply. On the declaration of war we should notify the enemy that we should warn those of her merchant ships coming home not to approach the island, as we were establishing a blockade of mines and submarines. Similarly, we should notify all neutrals that such a blockade had been established, and that if any of their vessels approached the island they would be liable to destruction, either by mines or submarines, and therefore would do so at their own risk."

This controversy took place before the present war was thought of. Sir Percy Scott was convinced that, trusting to the proverbial timidity of trade, the Germans would attack without scruple by all means

in their power. The belief that they would be held in check by "the sentiment of the world" was dismissed by him as "a dangerous and most misleading doctrine." And so it has proved.

An Excellent Veto.

Governor Whitman's announcement that he considers it his duty to veto the Sanders bill, transferring enforcement of certain safety provisions of the labor laws to the building authorities in first class cities, should be hailed with relief and approval. The measure is an obnoxious attempt by a rural resident to regulate the affairs of cities of which he has little knowledge and with which he has, politically, no concern. It is manifestly an effort to do that in "relieving real estate" which the vicious Lockwood-Ellenbogen bill was prevented from doing by Mayor Mitchell's veto. It would produce quite as disastrous a state of affairs in law enforcement and would undoubtedly be quite as dangerous in depriving workers of proper protection under the laws as that unlamented measure would have been.

The real estate owners who protest so vehemently against duplication of inspection, improper restrictions on property and the like have a case, but their methods this year have done much to alienate public sympathy from them. Instead of asking proper relief under existing laws, they have sought to procure laws which would give them benefits against the interest of thousands on thousands of others in the community. This has been prevented, fortunately. If they seek only that to which in fairness and equity they are entitled, there is little question that they will be able next year to agree with the city authorities and the State Labor Department on a bill which can be adopted without difficulty. When they ask for that which would sacrifice others for their benefit they must not expect public support.

Encouragement for Honesty.

John Dahlgren, released from a Minnesota penitentiary at the end of a long sentence, decided there was nothing in the life of crime. He went to Chicago, got work as a shoemaker, and saved money. Finally he went to Milwaukee and obtained work there, but was discharged after the police had told his employers he was an ex-convict. Discouraged, taunted by friends and acquaintances, he relapsed and is again doing "a bit" for this backsliding.

Is the responsibility for this more Dahlgren's or society's? The tendency in prison administration now—hailed everywhere as "prison reform"—is to treat the convicts as human beings, to give them some measure of self-government, to put them on their honor; in short, to endeavor to fit them by giving privileges and responsibilities in prison for the resumption of honest life when released. Yet this is futile if there is to be no general disposition to aid the individual who, once at liberty, honestly tries to live down his past. The public evidently needs educating as well as some of its old-fashioned prison administrators. If this waste material of humanity is ever to be anything but waste there must be more Mrs. Booths and more Fords to encourage and help released convicts as well as more Osbornes to help the men inside the walls.

Count von Bernstorff's "Let them think" was not meant, apparently, as an encouragement to neutrality of thought. He had better have taken a leaf from President Wilson's book.

T. R., if memory is not at fault, was hugely enjoying the limelight also when the Titanic went down.

Who Invented the Airship?

People in these days often get a good deal of credit for much that they have never done, and Count Zeppelin's claims as the inventor of the great airship which bears his name having been challenged the other day has rather increased my interest in two dirigible balloons invented as long ago as 1850—one by a Mr. H. A. Bell, an Englishman, and the other by a Frenchman named Pétin, both of which were illustrated and described in "The Illustrated London News" of that period. These aerostatic novelties appear to combine in their primitive way many of the leading features of the modern Zeppelin airship, for in Bell's design, which takes the form of an egg, we have in a more clumsy form the oval ends of the German vessel, as well as a car in the form of a boat, in which the power plant is carried, and which is used for landing on water if necessary. If, therefore, the internal combustion engine had been at the service of the inventor, it is possible that very different results might have been obtained, but being obliged to turn the two propellers (one on either side in orthodox manner) by hand, he naturally failed to obtain any specific control over the machine when it was released from Vauxhall Gardens in the presence of an expectant crowd. Assisted by the wind, though, he was able to turn it around, but could not bring the ship back to the starting place. Another point is that he used a metal frame, as well as a metal rudder, which took the form of a bird's tail. It would thus seem that Bell anticipated several of Count Zeppelin's leading ideas—namely, the long, horizontal gas bag, the metal fuselage, screw propellers and pontoon car. For the idea of the balloon, however, we have to turn to M. Pétin's system, for although vague, the germ of it is there right enough. Instead of employing a large number of independent enclosed gas bags, as is done in the case of the Zeppelin vessel, M. Pétin sought to overcome the weight problem by using four large detached spherical balloons, one behind the other. These are held together by an enormous metal framework for the passengers, and which is used to support the vertical helices for raising and lowering the vessel. Beyond, however, the employment of these gas bags there is nothing in Pétin's system which can be said to resemble that of the German inventor, but between them Mr. Bell and M. Pétin undoubtedly contributed something to the science of aerial navigation, which may or may not have come to the notice of Count Zeppelin and inspired the manufacturers of his design. But it is too late in the day now for any one to make claims of priority in things of this kind. The Zeppelin airship will be identified with his name for all time, but in one connection, at least, the systems of all three men are alike—they cannot be depended upon.



The Loss of the Lusitania

"American-Germans."

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Already the American-German is beginning to defend the sinking of the Lusitania, and German pressure and bias will immediately be noticed from Washington. Yet this country apparently fails to realize how far the stealthy invasion by this not-to-be-naturalized nation has progressed. What of the sagacity of a government that fails to heed the German law of July 22, 1913, concerning imperial and state nationality, which permits a German to become naturalized in another country without losing his original nationality. Article 25 of this law stipulates as follows:

"Whoever, before acquiring a foreign nationality, shall, on application to the competent authorities of his native state, have obtained the written permission to retain his German nationality does not lose it."

Baron von Richthofen, speaking on this subject before the Reichstag, made the following statement:

"We are happy to remark that the bill permits Germans who, for motive of an economic kind, are compelled to acquire a foreign nationality, to retain at the same time their imperial nationality. . . . As regards certain countries the new situation that the law proposes to create is very desirable. I confine myself to mentioning that in England a merchant is not admitted to the London Stock Exchange unless he is a British subject. Moreover, in the countries of Latin South America it is not easy for a German without the nationality of the country where he resides to compete with those possessing such nationality."

An international law review comments on the foregoing as follows:

"That which is new and apparently without precedent is a legislative disposition inviting nationals to secure abroad through factitious naturalization certain material advantages reserved for natives of the country. A text like Paragraph 2 of Article 25 is a direct invitation to fraud and to perjury," etc.

New York, May 8, 1915.

Try "Kultur's" Representative.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Would it not be becoming for the United States flag on the City Hall to be at half-mast as a feeble protest against the murder of American citizens (men, women and children), who were not given the least show for their lives by the unpatriotic and insane Germans and their paid assassins in torpedoing the unarmed Lusitania?

How far and how long is this German Kultur to be allowed to have full swing? Perhaps the "United States first" can modify it a little by again issuing its assurances of the high esteem in which it is held in Washington, and the interchange of a few more birthday greetings might tend to have it firmly established here.

The fact remains that the representative of Kultur to this country had clear insight that murder was to be done, and has not as yet, so far as is known, put the authorities in possession of the guilty parties' names, and so, that he, as accessory to murder, should be forthwith placed on trial for his miserable life for premeditated murder.

AN AMERICAN CITIZEN.

Brooklyn, May 8, 1915.

History Repeats.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: History tells of a dastardly act committed by a moral pervert that his name might go down to posterity.

Should Uncle Sam Go to War.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: It seems reasonably clear that Germany, by her insolent disregard of all rules and amenities of civilized warfare, is willfully arraying all the civilized world against her, in a supreme confidence in her unconquerable might. Might, not right, is the issue she offers, in which she hopes to prevail.

It also seems increasingly obvious that Germany is deliberately seeking to embroil the United States in the present war. For this proposition it is not necessary to cite particular acts, for they are fresh in every mind.

Such a war between Germany and the United States would, of course, involve at the outset the seizure of the German shipping in our ports, valued at something like \$100,000,000, besides the warships that are interned. Why are the Germans willing to pay so much, in advance, for the sake of such a war?

Some reason for this course may be found in the policy of the present administration of "watchful waiting," which the German mind interprets as a policy of timidity and weakness, which it is supposed will do all things to avoid war.

But behind this there is probably a more subtle calculation and purpose. Among our hundred millions here are something like twenty millions of Germans. With few and honorable exceptions, these twenty millions are judged by the German government to be German first and American afterward; and are regarded as ready to throw their influence, and, if need be, their personal efforts, against the country of their adoption whenever an issue may arise between Germany and the United States.

Whether this conviction be well founded or not, it suffices for present purposes that Germany entertains it and counts upon it. Germany may well reason that if the United States were provoked to war with her 20 per cent of the Americans, people would take up her cause here; and that not in passive sympathy, but in active co-operation. Furnished with German money and endowed with German patriotism, these twenty millions may be expected to rise and assert themselves in some revolutionary way against our own government and to paralyze any attempt of our government to engage vigorously in such a war with Germany. The German League, which was heralded some months ago and which now remains in ominous silence, is the natural nucleus here, and to right among us on every hand, for such an exploit.

Such a league, supplied with arms and united in action, might readily overpower our small regular army and the militia forces which could be called to its aid; might by a premeditated plan take possession of our forts and arsenals, and for the time being dictate terms to the national authorities, who would be taken by surprise.

There is a darker side to the picture of possibilities. With their system of espionage the Germans have in all probability several spies in the crew of every important warship of the United States, and many agents in all the principal cities or places where arms are made or stored.

With the remorseless ideas with which the Germans carry on war, it is to be expected that if war were declared between Germany and the United States every available means would be employed by the secret agents of Germany to blow up our ships, to blow up or burn our armories and arsenals, to destroy our public buildings, and even to try to set fire to our towns and cities, in order to strike terror into the hearts of loyal citizens.

Against such possibilities due precautions should be taken, and at once. The army should be increased. The spies should be hunted down. All traitorous organizations should be put under the ban of the law and suppressed.

More than this: Germany should be made to understand that if the United States is forced into a war against her it will put into the field within six months' time two million men, good fighting men, as good as her best, and that these will meet her forces on the fields of France or of Russia and will be supplemented by as many more as may be needed, and that when the United States goes to war it goes to win, and will not stop short of final and absolute victory.

What Did McKinley Do?

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Our citizens have been murdered. It seems to me that there is but one duty for the President of the United States—not to fortify himself with the moral courage necessary to "withstand the clamor of an indignant people," but to ask himself the plain question:

What would Washington have done? What would Lincoln have done? What did McKinley do?

And in this hour when the nation mourns some of its most honored men, we—the Americans—are obliged to calmly witness the rejoicing of the aliens within our gates—foreigners and perjurers to their oaths of allegiance alike—who celebrate in the public places the calamity which has deprived us of our brothers.

Stop! Vanderbilt, Frohman, Klein are no more! And think, and, having thought, act! JULIUS LOYAL SEWARD.

New York, May 8, 1915.

Hyphenated Traitors.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The hyphenated creatures who have been allowed too long to make a convenience of this country have now shown their real colors. The murder of more than a hundred American citizens, including women and children, is to them a cause of great rejoicing, as it means a victory for German savagery. To every true American this spectacle of ghastly jubilation on the part of these hypocrites and renegades is horribly revolting.

The time has come when such anti-American demonstrations are no longer to be tolerated. "Success to German brutality, whatever it cost America," is a treasonable sentiment and should be treated accordingly. Any German who utters words to that effect on the street or in print (whether he happens to have perjured himself into the privileges of American citizenship or not) should be arrested as a traitor. LAWTON MACKALL.

New York, May 8, 1915.

Remember the Belgian Women.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: We have been hearing much lately about English "war babies" and their mothers, but we hear very little of the "war babies" and their pitiful mothers in Belgium and France—those poor, defenceless women and girls whose bodies have suffered such unmentionable abuses from the Germans. Those are the women to whom our hearts should go out in sympathy, those poor women beyond the reach of help. We haven't been told much about these victims—it is unprintable—but we are nevertheless finding it all out, and when we become fully awake to what women must expect whenever an invading army enters a city or town we women are going to be heard and listened to. We can live without Kultur, and we intend to put a stop to that kind of Kultur. If there are not enough men to protect women from the "cultured" men we ourselves will get to work and find some effective way to protect and preserve our bodies from them. Our motto will be: "Remember the fate of the Belgian women." NORA CANTWELL.

New York, May 8, 1915.

American Stupidity.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In the new sea disaster the lives of more than a hundred Americans are lost, many of them will have to thank the well known stupidity of the American press for their fate. Let us admit for the sake of argument that

The Conning Tower

MAY 7TH, 1915

Ye, who strank with a holy zeal  
From sound or sight of the naked steel,  
Harnessed and caked with rust,  
Ye scrambled for gain in the sordid dust,  
Ye vanished spear in the days of old  
Was nailed and dulled in your search for gold.  
Ye spoke of Christ and turned, blind-eyed  
From his shell-wrecked house, where his children  
died.

Ye sought with gifts to hide the stain  
Of women shamed and their babies slain,  
Ye talked of Peace and the Crime of Force  
To turn the bar in his blood-crazed course.  
Oh mark the end of the mad ye trod  
Where the blind sea echoes the voice of God,  
Ye dreamed by night of the spoken word  
To turn the edge of the falling sword  
Ye dreamed by Truth and the voice of prayer  
To hold the beast in his reeking lair  
Ye cried aloud of your purpose clean  
And answer came through the submarine,  
In vain your woe and the tears ye shed,  
The sea holds fast to your new-made dead,  
And thought for powder and speech and shell  
Must scathe the land where the killers dwell.  
He holds to peace with a steadfast hand  
Whose olive branch is his strongest brand.  
Ay mark the end of the road ye trod  
Where the blind sea echoes the voice of God.  
F. F. V.

The motto of the neutral nation is "We Should Worry." The motto of the Jingo is "We Should Hurry." But we should not hurry, and especially should we not hurry the President.

All the bleacher cries of "Take him out!" will not remove the President from office. While he is in office his judgment must determine the nation's course. He needs a lot of standing-by. Eventually you will have to stand by him. Why not now?

There is the matter of the President's golf playing Saturday morning. There was a lot of easy talk about that yesterday. "How could he do it?" folks asked. Why shouldn't he have done it? Perhaps he had not slept all Friday night; perhaps in no other way could he gather his nerves. And perhaps, going round the course, some unusually wise thing occurred to him.

We wonder how the Lusitania massacre affected the President's golf. Our responsibility in this crisis is less than his, yet since Friday afternoon we have been hardly able to hit a tennis-ball over the net. We fear that our mind, like Mr. Wilson's, is a single-track affair, and that no idea will go through until the block is open.

THE PRAYER OF AN ANGUISHED MAN.

W. W.  
Oh God, why is it given me,  
In this dark, fearsome hour,  
To guide the helm of State, o'ercast  
With shadows fierce and dour?

Have pity, Lord, and strip from me  
The sceptre of my power.  
Stain not my hands with brothers' blood.  
Disperse these clouds that lower.

I pray this cup may pass; I pray  
Thou take away this blight.  
If not, God grant that I may act  
With justice and for right.  
R. L. BURDICK.

It seemed unlikely that Germany would attempt to sink the Lusitania. Almost as far from possibility as that, if you asked anybody a year ago this lovely May morning, there could ever be another great war.

Das ist des Deutschen Vaterland,  
Wo Eide schwört der Druck der Hand,  
Wo Treue hell vom Auge blitzt—  
Und Liebe warm in Herzen stitzt—  
Das soll es sein!  
Das, wackrer Deutscher, nenne dein!  
—Ernst Moritz Arndt.

Translated, it goes about like this:  
There is the German Fatherland,  
Where the oath is bound by the hearty  
hand,  
Where Faith shines brightly from the  
eyes  
And in the heart a warm love lies—  
That is your land!  
That, noble German, call your own!  
Etwas satirist, Herr Arndt, was?

Speaking of blood thirst—as who is not?—the Orpheum Theatre program, Denver, carries this ad: "Don't Kill Your Wife. Let the Western Columbia Laundry Do the Work."

Of course, we might have set that item as an excerpt, and put a headline on it—"Domestic Finish."

The Woolworth of Wardness is attained by a publishing house which advertises "the regular gold embossed, leather bound, gilded all around de Luxe Edition."

Of course, the jubilant Germans warned passengers about to embark. In the same way the Interborough should warn all passengers that a state of poor ventilation exists in its crowded cars and that persons absorbing bacilli do so at a t. o. r.

"Be fair," counsels the Kaiser. "And," he might add, "as we are all rather busy over here, suppose you furnish 99% of the fairness."

Germany, we are informed, is having a large sign painted, to be stuck up across the universe. The sign says "Verbieten."

Crack! crack! went several thousand neutralities yesterday, under the strain.

Let Samuel Taylor Coleridge have the last word this morning.  
"The very deep did rot: O Christ!  
That ever this should be!"  
F. P. A.